

OBJECTION

The Federal Redistribution 2009
NSW



Objection Number 41

by

Dr Mark Mulcair

6 Pages

From: Mark Mulcair [markmulcair@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 24 August 2009 6:10 PM
To: NSW Redistribution
Subject: Objections to NSW Redistribution
Attachments: NSW Objection 2.doc



Dear Committee Members,

Please find attached my objections to the 2009 NSW redistribution.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Dr Mark Mulcair

OBJECTIONS TO THE REDISTRIBUTION OF NEW SOUTH WALES 2009

GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, I think the Committee has done a good job. One of the most pleasing aspects of this redistribution is that many unpopular and controversial decisions from 2006 have been reversed, resulting in a pattern of seats similar to those seen before the last redistribution. While the decision to abolish a high growth seat such as Reid was a very surprising one, and the large-scale reversal of 2006 was unexpected, I have no objection to the general thrust of the redistribution and propose no major rethinking at this late stage.

Although I have lodged eighteen objections to the redistribution, most of these are relatively minor adjustments involving at most a few thousand electors. Objection 6 is more substantial, but I believe results in much stronger boundaries for Throsby and Gilmore. The final objection relates solely to the naming of divisions, and proposes the retention of the name 'Reid'.

Note that all four objections to Parkes (Objections 1, 3, 4 and 5) could be upheld without pushing Parkes outside tolerance. The division would also remain in tolerance if any of the four Objections were upheld independently.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Objection 1: Page/New England/Parkes

The Committee proposes detaching a small part of Tenterfield LGA to Page. While this area may have some connection with Page, in keeping with the general principle of keeping rural shires together, I suggest this area remain in New England.

I note that this would put New England outside tolerance, so I suggest the part of Gwydir LGA in New England be transferred to Parkes. This unites Gwydir LGA and leaves Parkes and New England within tolerance.

Objection 2: Paterson/Newcastle

The proposed boundaries still leave part of Port Stephens LGA within Newcastle. At the last redistribution there was strong objection to the splitting of Port Stephens LGA, and to the placing of its southern parts in Newcastle. I suggest that this area be returned to Paterson, and in compensation Newcastle gain Metford from Paterson. Metford would fit well in Newcastle, which already contains some of the localities between Newcastle and Maitland. This would result in a net gain of about 300 electors to Newcastle, leaving both divisions well within tolerance.

I note from the Committee's proposals the desire to make maximum use of the Hunter River as a boundary in this region. Transferring the balance of Port Stephens to Paterson would extend the use of the Hunter River even further, and provide a very strong and obvious northern boundary for Newcastle.

Objection 3: Calare/Parkes

Wellington LGA is proposed to be split between Calare and Parkes. While parts of Wellington may have a strong community of interest with Dubbo, I believe that if possible the shire should remain unsplit.

Since Calare is at the low end of tolerance, and Parkes at the high end (especially if Objection 1 is upheld), all of Wellington LGA could be united in Calare without the need for changes elsewhere.

Objection 4: Riverina/Parkes

As with the previous objection, while there may be some community of interest between the southern part of Lachlan LGA and Riverina, it makes more sense to keep Lachlan LGA together in the one division (Parkes). Since Riverina is proposed to be set at the very top of tolerance, it could easily accommodate the loss of these electors.

Objection 5: Farrer/Parkes

While Farrer requires no change, it would seem sensible to transfer its share of Central Darling LGA to Parkes, uniting the LGA in Parkes.

Objection 6: Gilmore/Throsby/Cunningham

I did propose the transfer of Wingecarribee LGA to Throsby in my original suggestion. However, under the Committee's proposals, large parts of Shellharbour LGA would then need to be placed in Gilmore, with the built-up area of Shellharbour proper split between two divisions.

I suggest instead that the part of Wingecarribee LGA proposed to be transferred to Throsby instead be placed in Gilmore. Note that this area has previously been in Gilmore. This change would then allow all of Shellharbour plus Kiama LGA to be united in Throsby. I submit this provides a much better arrangement of seats in the area, with Throsby a clear Shellharbour/Kiama seat, and Gilmore a clearly rural seat surrounding it. It would also reduce the number of electors transferred between divisions.

This change would result in a net transfer of about 2000 electors to Throsby, placing it outside tolerance. This can be adjusted very neatly by transferring the balance of Unanderra to Cunningham, moving the boundary from the Princes Highway to the Southern Freeway.

Objection 7: Macarthur/Werriwa

The Committee proposes that more of Campbelltown LGA be added to Macarthur, while still leaving part of Camden LGA in Werriwa. It would make far more sense to leave Blairmount, Blair Athol and Woodbine in Werriwa, and instead transfer the balance of Camden LGA to Macarthur. I also recommend Macarthur instead of Werriwa gain the Austral area, as Austral fits better with the semi-rural parts of Camden and Liverpool than with the rest of Werriwa. These numbers balance almost exactly, result in Camden LGA being re-united in Macarthur, and improve community of interest in both divisions.

Objection 8: Banks/Hughes

The boundary between these two divisions appears to follow fairly minor streets through Revesby. I suggest The River Road is a stronger and more obvious boundary through this region. This change would keep the bulk of Revesby, including the station and shopping centre, in a single division (Hughes).

Objection 9: Banks/Barton/Watson

I suggest a slight rotation of these three divisions to better reflect community of interest:

- Banks moves eastward to gain Carss Park and Kogarah Bay. I submit these suburbs now fit better with Blakehurst and Allawah in Banks than with the remainder of Barton.
- Barton then moves its boundary with Watson from Cup and Saucer Creek to the strong boundary of Canterbury Road, east of Bexley Road.
- Finally, Watson gains the area bounded by Canterbury Road, Belmore Road, the M5, and Salt Pan Creek. This results in a neater split of Riverwood along the motorway, and places all of Punchbowl within Watson.

In each case, only a few thousand electors are transferred, leaving all three divisions well within tolerance.

Objection 10: Kingsford Smith/Wentworth

I still believe a stronger boundary with Kingsford Smith can be obtained by using Alison Road instead of King/Stanley Street (as suggested in my original submission), and the Clovelly suburb boundary instead of Clovelly Road (as originally suggested by the ALP).

Objection 11: McMahon/Watson

The Committee proposes transferring 'Strathfield South' from Lowe to Watson, yet from the map it is clear that Strathfield itself will be split along minor roads such as Woodward Avenue and Elwin Street. This would be a confusing boundary in the area, and cuts off the southern part of Strathfield from its community of interest in McMahon. Further east, the boundary along the railway line splits the centre of Burwood, and results in Croydon being split three ways.

I suggest the boundary in the Strathfield area be moved south to Liverpool Road, uniting the bulk of Strathfield in McMahon. In exchange, Watson can move its boundary north to Parramatta Road, which is also the Burwood LGA boundary. This unites all of Burwood LGA and the suburb of Burwood in one division, and reduces the number of divisions into which Croydon is split.

Objection 12: Blaxland/McMahon

The boundary through Lidcombe and Berala (east of Park Road) appears to follow CCD boundaries and minor streets. I suggest that Vaughan Street, the railway line and Olympic Drive represents a clearer boundary through this area. This would result in a transfer of about 2000 electors from McMahon to Blaxland, leaving both divisions within tolerance.

Objection 13: Bradfield/North Sydney

In the Chatswood area, I submit that Boundary Street (a major road that is also the Willoughby LGA boundary) is a more logical boundary than Ashley Street.

Since part of the boundary between these two divisions is proposed to run along Boundary Street anyway, it seems sensible to simply continue in a straight line as far as Pacific Highway, rather than make the deviation onto Ashley Street. This change would only involve around 1200 electors.

Objection 14: Bennelong/Berowra

The transfer of around 1900 electors in Beecroft is not necessary, and would leave these electors cut off from the rest of Berowra by the M2 Motorway. The M2 is a very clear boundary in the region, and I recommend it be retained.

Objection 15: Mitchell/Parramatta

The proposed boundary along Hammers Road leaves part of Northmead in Parramatta. It would make sense for all of Northmead to be placed in Mitchell, by continuing the boundary along Toongabbie Creek and Parramatta River to Windsor Road. This results in a transfer of around 1600 electors from Parramatta to Mitchell, which both divisions can accommodate.

Objection 16: Greenway/Chifley/Prospect/Parramatta

I believe the existing boundary between Greenway and Chifley is superior to the boundary proposed by the Committee. Shanes Park and Marsden Park are a much better fit with the semi-rural northern part of Greenway than with the Mount Druitt area. Likewise, Sunnyholt and Blacktown Roads are strong and obvious boundaries which keep the bulk of Blacktown in one division, whereas the new boundaries would see the suburb of Blacktown split. I suggest the Committee reverse its decision and revert to the existing boundary between these two divisions.

This exchange would leave Chifley within (although at the very top of) tolerance, and could be made in isolation. However, I suggest Chifley's new excess be used to tidy up the boundaries of Prospect and Parramatta, as follows:

Firstly, Chifley could straighten its boundary with Prospect by moving back to the Great Western Highway, retaining about 3000 Minchinbury electors in Prospect. Prospect could then move its boundary with Parramatta to the Cumberland Highway, which is a stronger boundary than Centenary and Sherwood Roads. This would transfer around 5000 electors and unite Merrylands West and South Wentworthville in Parramatta.

Note that changes to Prospect and Parramatta could only be done in conjunction with Objection 15, as without the loss of Northmead, Parramatta would be above tolerance. If Objection 15 was not upheld, the Committee should still consider the exchange between Greenway and Chifley in isolation.

Objection 17: Parramatta/Blaxland

A very minor adjustment at the south-eastern corner of Parramatta: I submit that Park and Lisgar Streets are more appropriate boundaries than Lackey Street in this area. This would only involve a handful of electors.

Objection 18: Retention of the name 'Reid'

Given the significance of the name 'Reid', the Committee should make every effort to retain a division of that name. I suggest that the proposed division of 'Parramatta' be renamed 'Reid'; the proposed division contains around half the electors from the existing division of Reid, and the importance of honouring an Australian Prime Minister is much greater maintaining a geographic name.

Abolishing the name 'Parramatta' would also help avoid future problems in keeping the Parramatta CBD and surrounds in a division of that name (similar to those seen in 2006).